DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 596 EM 009 439

AUTHOR	Suppes, Patrick
TITLE	On the Grammar and Model-Theoretic Semantics of Children's Noun Phrases.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Univ., Calif. Inst. for Mathematical Studies in Social Science.
SPONS AGENCY	National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Office of Naval Research, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	TR-181
PUB DATE	29 Nov 71
NOTE	20p.; Psychology and Education Series
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Child Language; Computer Programs; *Descriptive Linguistics; *Generative Grammar; Grammar; Mathematical Applications; *Mathematical Logic; Models; *Semantics; Sentence Structure; Set Theory

ABSTRACT

The paper shows informally how model-theoretical semantics may be used by a computer to give a straight-forward analysis of the meaning of children's language. This approach to semantics grows out of the main thrust of work in mathematical logic. It is discussed in the framework of generative grammar and is based on the application of the mathematical concepts of "set" and "function" and the statistical concept of "probability" to grammar. The corpora used are the tape-recorded utterances of three children, age two, one French-speaking, one English-speaking, one Chinese-speaking. The relationship of adjectives to nouns in their noun phrases is analyzed to illustrate the methodology of this approach. (JK)

ED057596

ON THE GRAMMAR AND MODEL-THEORETIC SEMANTICS OF CHILDREN'S NOUN PHRASES

BY

PATRICK SUPPES

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 181

NOVEMBER 29, 1971

PSYCHOLOGY & EDUCATION SERIES

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

EM 007 439

TECHNICAL REPORTS

PSYCHOLOGY SERIES

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

(Place of publication shown in parentheses; if published title is different from title of Technical Report, this is also shown in parentheses.)

(For reports no. 1 - 44, see Technical Report no. 125.)

50 R. C. Atkinson and R. C. Calfee. Mathematical learning theory. January 2, 1963. (In B. B. Wolman (Ed.), Scientific Psychology. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1965. Pp. 254-275)

51 P. Suppes, E. Crothers, and R. Weir. Application of mathematical learning theory and linguistic analysis to vowel phoneme matching in Russian words. December 28, 1962.

52 R. C. Atkinson, R. Calfee, G. Sommer, W. Jeffrey and R. Shoemaker. A test of three models for stimulus compounding with children. January 29, 1963. (J. exp. Psychol., 1964, 67, 52-58)

53 E. Crothers. General Markov models for learning with inter-trial forgetting. April 8, 1963.

54 J. L. Myers and R. C. Atkinson. Choice behavior and reward structure. May 24, 1963. (Journal math. Psychol., 1964, 1, 170-203)

55 R. E. Robinson. A set-theoretical approach to empirical meaningfulness of measurement statements. June 10, 1963.

56 E. Crothers, R. Weir and P. Palmer. The role of transcription in the learning of the orthographic representations of Russian sounds. June 17,. 1963.

57 P. Suppes. Problems of optimization in learning a list of simple items. July 22, 1963. (In Maynard W. Shelly, II and Glenn L. Bryan (Eds.), Human Judgments and Optimality. New York: Wiley. 1964. Pp. 116-126)

58 R. C. Atkinson and E. J. Crothers. Theoretical note: all-or-none learning and intertrial forgetting. July 24, 1963.

59 R. C. Calfee. Long-term behavior of rats under probabilistic reinforcement schedules. October 1, 1963.

60 R. C. Atkinson and E. J. Crothers. Tests of acquisition and retention, axioms for paired-associate learning. October 25, 1963. (A comparison of paired-associate learning models having different acquisition and retention axioms, J. math. Psychol., 1964, 1, 285-315)

61 W. J. McGill and J. Gibbon. The general-gamma distribution and reaction times. November 20, 1963. (J. math. Psychol., 1965, 2, 1-18)

62 M. F. Norman. Incremental learning on random trials. December 9, 1963. (J. math. Psychol., 1964, 1, 336-351)

63 P. Suppes. The development of mathematical concepts in children. February 25, 1964. (On the behavioral foundations of mathematical concepts. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 1965, 30, 60-96)

64 P. Suppes. Mathematical concept formation in children. April 10, 1964. (Amer. Psychologist, 1966, 21, 139-150)

65 R. C. Calfee, R. C. Atkinson, and T. Shelton, Jr. Mathematical models for verbal learning. August 21, 1964. (In N. Wiener and J. P. Schoda (Eds.), Cybernetics of the Nervous System: Progress in Brain Research. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Elsevier Publishing Co., 1965. Pp. 333-349)

66 L. Keller, M. Cole, C. J. Burke, and W. K. Estes. Paired associate learning with differential rewards. August 20, 1964. (Reward and information values of trial outcomes in paired associate learning. (Psychol. Monogr., 1965, 79, 1-21)

67 M. F. Norman. A probabilistic model for free-responding. December 14, 1964.

68 W. K. Estes and H. A. Taylor. Visual detection in relation to display size and redundancy of critical elements. January 25, 1965, Revised 7-1-65. (Perception and Psychophysics, 1966, 1, 9-16)

69 P. Suppes and J. Donio. Foundations of stimulus-sampling theory for continuous-time processes. February 9, 1965. (J. math. Psychol., 1967, 4, 202-225)

70 R. C. Atkinson and R. A. Kinchla. A learning model for forced-choice detection experiments. February 10, 1965. (Br. J. math stat. Psychol., 1965, 18, 184-206)

71 E. J. Crothers. Presentation orders for items from different categories. March 10, 1965.

72 P. Suppes, G. Groen, and M. Schlag-Rey. Some models for response latency in paired-associates learning. May 5, 1965. (J. math. Psychol., 1966, 3, 99-128)

73 M. V. Levine. The generalization function in the probability learning experiment. June 3, 1965.

74 D. Hansen and T. S. Rodgers. An exploration of psycholinguistic units in initial reading. July 6, 1965.

75 B. C. Arnold. A correlated urn-scheme for a continuum of responses. July 20, 1965.

76 C. Izawa and W. K. Estes. Reinforcement-test sequences in paired-associate learning. August 1, 1965. (Psychol. Reports, 1966, 18, 879-919)

77 S. L. Blehart. Pattern discrimination learning with Rhesus monkeys. September 1, 1965. (Psychol. Reports, 1966, 19, 311-324)

78 J. L. Phillips and R. C. Atkinson. The effects of display size on short-term memory. August 31, 1965.

79 R. C. Atkinson and R. M. Shiffrin. Mathematical models for memory and learning. September 20, 1965.

80 P. Suppes. The psychological foundations of mathematics. October 25, 1965. (Colloques Internationaux du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Editions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique. Paris: 1967. Pp. 213-242)

81 P. Suppes. Computer-assisted instruction in the schools: potentialities, problems, prospects. October 29, 1965.

82 R. A. Kinchla, J. Townsend, J. Yellott, Jr., and R. C. Atkinson. Influence of correlated visual cues on auditory signal detection. November 2, 1965. (Perception and Psychophysics, 1966, 1, 67-73)

83 P. Suppes, M. Jerman, and G. Groen. Arithmetic drills and review on a computer-based teletype. November 5, 1965. (Arithmetic Teacher, April 1966, 303-309.

84 P. Suppes and L. Hyman. Concept learning with non-verbal geometrical stimuli. November 15, 1968.

85 P. Holland. A variation on the minimum chi-square test. (J. math. Psychol., 1967, 3, 377-413).

86 P. Suppes. Accelerated program in elementary-school mathematics -- the second year. November 22, 1965. (Psychology in the Schools, 1966, 3, 294-307)

87 P. Lorenzen and F. Binford. Logic as a dialogical game. November 29, 1965.

88 L. Keller, W. J. Thomson, J. R. Tweedy, and R. C. Atkinson. The effects of reinforcement interval on the acquisition of paired-associate responses. December 10, 1965. (J. exp. Psychol., 1967, 73, 268-277)

89 J. I. Yellott, Jr. Some effects on noncontingent success in human probability learning. December 15, 1965.

90 P. Suppes and G. Groen. Some counting models for first-grade performance data on simple addition facts. January 14, 1966. (In J. M. Scandura (Ed.), Research in Mathematics Education. Washington, D. C.: NCTM, 1967. Pp. 35-43.

91 P. Suppes. Information processing and choice behavior. January 31, 1966.

92 G. Groen and R. C. Atkinson. Models for optimizing the learning process. February 11, 1966. (Psychol. Bulletin, 1966, 66, 309-320)

93 R. C. Atkinson and D. Hansen. Computer-assisted instruction in initial reading: Stanford project. March 17, 1966. (Reading Research Quarterly, 1966, 2, 5-25)

94 P. Suppes. Probabilistic inference and the concept of total evidence. March 23, 1966. (In J. Hintikka and P. Suppes (Eds.), Aspects of Inductive Logic. Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Co., 1966. Pp. 49-65.

95 P. Suppes. The axiomatic method in high-school mathematics. April 12, 1966. (The Role of Axiomatics and Problem Solving in Mathematics. The Conference Board of the Mathematical Sciences, Washington, D. C. Ginn and Co., 1966. Pp. 69-76.

(Continued on inside back cover)

ED057596

ON THE GRAMMAR AND MODEL-THEORETIC SEMANTICS OF CHILDREN'S NOUN PHRASES

by

Patrick Suppes

TECHNICAL REPORT NO. 181

November 29, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PSYCHOLOGY AND EDUCATION SERIES

Reproduction in Whole or in Part is Permitted for

any Purpose of the United States Government

INSTITUTE FOR MATHEMATICAL STUDIES IN THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

STANFORD, CALIFORNIA

On the Grammar and Model-Theoretic Semantics of Children's Noun Phrases[1]

Patrick Suppes

Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

I had originally intended to prepare for this colloquium a detailed analysis of noun phrases used by children in English, French and Chinese. That program of work is well under way, but is not sufficiently complete to offer a systematic and summary presentation of results at this time. However, in view of the difficulties I have encountered on other occasions in communicating the ideas of model-theoretic semantics to linguists or psychologists not primarily interested in or familiar with the work in the theory of models in modern logic, I think a discursive and informally organized explanatory paper may actually serve a useful purpose.

At the Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences at Stanford we have under way a detailed analysis of several large corpora. Two of them are extensive recordings of children whose first language is English and whose ages are between two and three years. We have 20 hours recorded for one girl and more than 40 hours for a second, with the second still continuing. A third corpus is that of a young French boy, whose age is in the same range as that of the two American girls. With more than 16 hours recorded and transcribed, the data collection for the French boy continues at the rate of one hour per week. Finally, we have recordings from two Mandarin-speaking children, who are also between two and three years of age.

The corpora of all the children are recorded on tape and then transcribed and input into our computer system at the Institute for extensive

analysis by a variety of programs. This work is being conducted in conjunction with a number of younger colleagues, and detailed results of the work will be presented in collaborative publications with them. The work in French is being conducted in collaboration with Madeleine Léveillé of the Laboratoire de Psychologie in Paris, the Chinese corpus is being collected and analyzed in collaboration with Dr. Teresa Cheng of the Phonology Laboratory, University of California at Berkeley, and the analysis of the two English corpora, together with all of the computer programming, is being done in collaboration with Mr. Robert Smith of the Institute.

Our objective is to provide a relatively complete grammar and model-theoretic semantics of these corpora. In previous papers (Suppes, 1970 and 1971) I have elaborated on the technical details of the work. The first of these papers describes the methods we are using for constructing probabilistic grammars and the second the model-theoretic approach to semantics. Further application of the notion of probabilistic grammar was made in Elizabeth Gammon's dissertation (1970).

I shall not try to recapitulate the technical details but rather try to explain in an informal way the underlying ideas and their sources.

In the case of the grammar, the analysis is done within a generative framework. The line of attack is to write a generative grammar and to attach to each production rule of the grammar a conditional probability of its use, given that a rewrite occurs of the nonterminal symbol that is the first half of the rule. The applications thus far have been in terms of context-free grammars, but the basic idea is not restricted to context-free grammars. It is certainly applicable in direct fashion to indexed grammars that are context-sensitive but not context-free, and also to optional transformations. Once such grammars are constructed for a corpus and the probabilities for the use of a given rule are estimated by standard statistical methods, an ordinary criterion of goodness-of-fit test can be performed in order to compare one grammar with another for the same corpus. The idea that is new is the introduction of probabilities and the application of standard goodness-of-fit tests to evaluate the grammar. There is more to be said here than this sketch conveys, and I know from previous discussions that a detailed clarification of what is involved in constructing the probabilistic part of such a grammar would be desirable.

However, making a generative grammar probabilistic is a minor affair compared to the difficulties and subtleties involved in adding a model-theoretic semantics to that generative grammar. I therefore want to spend most of my time today discussing in the framework of generative grammars the approach to semantics that grows out of the main thrust of work in mathematical logic.

The technical apparatus of contemporary model theory in logic is substantial, but the underlying ideas, which go back to Frege in the 19th century, are completely intuitive and straightforward. The idea is to have a clear and definite procedure for assigning a meaning to an utterance, and to do this, one must be able to show how each word in a sentence performs a definite function. I admit at once that this statement sounds far too vague and uninformative, but the word function means something more here. As a first recast of this idea, we can begin by saying that we shall use standard techniques of modern mathematics to give a set-theoretical account of the meaning of a sentence. This means that we talk about objects as set-theoretical objects, and thus, we talk about individuals, classes of individuals, classes of classes of individuals, relations between individuals, relations between classes and individuals, etc., functions of individuals, functions of classes, etc. All of these objects are built up in a natural way into a hierarchy of sets, with of course in the classical view, relations and functions being particular kinds of sets, so that when we talk about the meaning of a sentence we must assign to each word a set-theoretical object. In the case of a noun like men we assign the class of men; in the case of an adjective like green we assign the class of green objects. Thus, fairly simple ideas of reference work. Already, however, there are adjectives that create problems. If we think of the phrase alleged dictators, it would not do to assign to the adjective alleged the class of alleged things, or at least, this already seems to be somewhat strange. Once we leave adjectives and nouns, the picture can become complicated rather quickly. For example, ordinary and simple-minded ideas of reference do not give us any clues of what object to assign to the definite article the, or what object to assign to a preposition like of. It is for situations

like this that set theory was created. The definite article or a preposition do not designate a simple set of individuals, but are more complicated set-theoretical functions or relations. We shall look at some examples shortly.

Another point that needs to be clarified early is that in first approximation it is often easier to assign a meaning that is a set-theoretical object to a phrase rather than to individual words. Let me give an example from some recent work I have been doing in another context. In a variety of computer applications and as a focal point of much research in computer science, there is a desire to develop question-answering systems so that when a question is input the computer can give back the correct answer. In analyzing a typical example much looked at because of its simplicity, namely, the geography of a set of countries, we might ask the question, "Does X have diplomatic relations with Y?" Now, if we take the simple approach that each single word designates a set-theoretical object, then the word relation in this context has a quite abstract set-theoretical object as its denotation. But, if instead, we take the phrase diplomatic relations as a denoting phrase, the parts of which do not denote, then a much simpler and more concrete set-theoretical object can be assigned to that phrase, namely, just what we expect as the ordinary binary relation between countries.

For some people the talk about set-theoretical objects will already seem somewhat abstract and perhaps obscure. It should be kept in mind that by set-theoretical object I ordinarily mean a fairly simple object like a class of individuals, a binary relation between individuals, etc. In ordinary talk anyway it is unusual to have set-theoretical objects of any really great complexity denoted by words or phrases occurring in the talk.

The next point of importance about the application of model-theoretic semantics to natural languages, as well as to formal languages, is that we cannot give an adequate account of meaning by assigning a denotation to individual words or phrases, or as we would tend to say in grammatical context, by assigning denotations to the terminal words. Set-theoretical functions now enter in a second way, namely, in telling us how denotations

of the various parts of the sentence are related. The analysis of how the various parts of a sentence are related in terms of meaning, that is, to put it explicitly now, what set-theoretical functions relate the denotations of the words occurring in the sentence, constitutes one important part of our intuitive idea of meaning.

Again, as in the case of the denotations of individual words, the set-theoretical functions that relate the denotations of individual words are ordinarily relatively simple in character. If I use the phrase red books, for instance, then the natural set-theoretical function for this phrase is the intersection of the set of red things and the set of books. The subtle thing about the semantical functions relating the various parts of a sentence is that the surface evidence for the choice of these semantic functions is considerably less evident than is the choice of the denotations of individual words or phrases. As far as I can see there is no escaping this difficulty. In one genuine and obvious sense, the semantic functions that represent the structure of the meaning of a sentence are theoretical in character. The correctness of a given choice cannot be settled by any direct observational procedure, but rather only by indirect procedures of confirming predictions, as for example, confirming a variety of predictions about responses to questions, executing actions taken in response to commands, etc. On the other hand, using a weaker standard of introspection, in many cases the selection of a particular set-theoretical function, seems obvious and natural to any native speaker of the language. It seems to me, for example, that this is the case with the selection of intersection in the case of red books. However, an example already given shows that this selection of function will not work uniformly with adjectives, namely, in the phrase alleged dictators.

If we look at a sentence of any complexity, it is natural to ask how the semantic functions that express the structure of the sentence, that is, the relationships between the denotations of the individual sentences or phrases, are to be built up. Fortunately, a straightforward answer is available to this question. With each production rule of the grammar there is associated a semantic function, and thus, we may convert each derivation tree for a given terminal utterance to a semantic tree

by attaching not only labels to the nodes of the tree, but also denotations generated by the semantic functions.

Let us illustrate these ideas with some simple examples. Consider first the rewrite rule

$$NP \rightarrow Adj + N \ .$$

The simple semantic function associated with this production rule is intersection of sets, as already discussed above. Using this production rule, let us construct the semantic tree for the phrase square table. Let S be the set of square-shaped things and T the set of tables. The denotation of each node of the tree is shown after the colon following the label of the node.

(1)



The semantic tree for the corresponding phrase in French looks very similar, except that a left-right reflection is made; however, the denotation of NP is left undisturbed, because intersection of sets is commutative.

(2)



I would like to say that an analogous use of intersection as the semantic function attached to the generating rule for simple noun phrases will suffice in a wide variety of languages. However, it is doubtful that this is the case, mainly because the grammatical structure of noun

phrases is different in other languages. Consider an example from our Chinese corpus, written in pinyin notation with tones indicated by the numerals 1-4 to make possible linear processing of computer input and output. The example is hong2 de hua1, literally, red of flower, and more idiomatically, red flower. Because of the extensive use of the particle de (or te), restraint seems required in classifying hong2 (red or redness) as an adjective. The semantical structure of this Chinese phrase is much like the English capitol of France or the French capitale de la France.

To draw the semantic tree of the Chinese phrase, we need some notation. Let MOD be an adjective-or-adverb-forming particle. For sets A, B and f, where f intuitively is a function, let ψ be the set-theoretical function defined as:

$$\psi(A,B,f) = f_A(B) ,$$

and f is a choice function such that for each A, $f_A(B) \subseteq B$.[2]

The tree looks like this.



Note that A is the set of red things, B is the set of flowers, and f is a function that selects the set of red flowers from the set of flowers. In other words, $f_A(B)$ is the set of red flowers.

Numerical adjectives. That the model-theoretic semantics can determine a choice between the generative or production rules of the grammar constructed for a corpus is nicely illustrated by the simple attributive use of numerical or cardinal concepts in children's speech. Let us begin with English and then look at some corresponding French and Chinese phrases.

An example as good as any is two red flowers. A part of our noun-phrase grammar, very close to the one I developed earlier for Adam I in Suppes (1971), might look like the following:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{NP} &\rightarrow \text{AdjP} + \text{N} \\
\text{AdjP} &\rightarrow \text{AdjP} + \text{Adj} \\
\text{AdjP} &\rightarrow \text{Car} \\
\text{AdjP} &\rightarrow \text{Adj} \ .
\end{aligned} \tag{3}
$$

Here "AdjP" is a nonterminal symbol used to obtain a simple recursion for building up adjective phrases, "Car" is a nonterminal symbol for cardinal number names, and "Poss" is, of course, for possessives. The last three rules of this grammar would most naturally have the identity function as its semantic function: each set is mapped into itself, and in the simple case the first two rules would have set intersection as the appropriate semantic function. Both identity and intersection functions have been used already; in trees (1) and (2), the lexical rules replacing Adj by square, etc., have the identity function as the semantic function. The semantic tree for two red flowers according to the grammar (3) would look like this.

(4)



I have written ? for the denotation that is not assignable at the node labeled "AdjP". The notation for the denotation of the root of the tree may look formidable, but its intuitive meaning is simple. I use the Frege-Russell concept of cardinal number: 2 is just the set of all pair sets. (To avoid standard paradoxes of set theory, I only consider members of sets a certain distance up the hierarchy of sets, functions and relations--this is a technical problem of no real concern here.) The set

$A \cap B$ is, as before, just the set of red flowers, and $\wp(A \cap B)$ is the power set of $A \cap B$, i.e., the family of all subsets of $A \cap B$.

It is important to realize that I am not suggesting that a speaker or listener of English is examining in any sense the entire set 2 or the large set $\wp(A \cap B)$. A model of language is being provided within a standard set-theoretical framework. To provide a psychological theory of how the child comes to understand these denotations is a matter that in my judgment requires still more set-theoretical machinery, not a different sort of mathematical framework from the set-theoretical one I am using.

There is a simple solution to our problem of the grammar of two red flowers. It is to let the semantics guide the construction of the tree, and thus of the generative rules. The tree we want is something close to the following:

(5)



And the partial grammar (3) should be revised to:

(6)

$$\begin{aligned} NP &\rightarrow Car + NP_1 \\ NP_1 &\rightarrow AdjP + N \\ AdjP &\rightarrow AdjP + Adj \\ AdjP &\rightarrow Adj \ . \end{aligned}$$

In (5) and (6) the subscript "1" on "NP" has been introduced to impose a restriction that blocks a recursion of cardinal number names. At any simple and straightforward level, we do not want phrases such as two three red flowers.

The French phrase corresponding to two red flowers is deux fleurs rouges, even though it is much more uncommon in French to omit the definite article than it is in English. The semantic tree is the same as (6), except for the sort of left-right reflection that occurred in going from (1) to (2):

(7)



The corresponding Chinese semantic tree that includes a noun classifier (NC) and the particle de (MOD) is more complicated on the surface than the English or French trees, but the underlying semantics is similar. (Later we shall look at some children's phrases in Chinese that omit the noun classifier or particle, thus making them closer in surface structure to the English or French examples.)

Teresa Cheng and I currently feel that the simplest semantics for the noun classifiers is to let them denote the union of all the sets of objects denoted by the nouns they modify. (When an NC is used as a mechanism of pronominal reference something more must be said.) On this assumption, our semantic tree for liang3 duo3 hong2 de hua1 (two red flowers) is:



Sample data. To show that the semantic functions I have been discussing are to be found in children's speech under the natural interpretation of what they are saying, I give some examples from Nina (English), Philippe (French) and Chi-Chi (Chinese).[3] All three of the children are between two and three years of age, but Nina and Philippe were closer to two than three at the time the particular instances were recorded.

I begin with the intersection function for Adj + N. In the Chinese examples the particle de does not occur. Instances in which it does are listed below.

Intersection Function

red fish	aiguille rouge	hong2 hua1er1 (red flower)
big bird	grosse raquette	bai2 yi1shang (white dress)
big kitty-cat	bon côté	xiao3 yang2la4 (little candle)
big mousie	petits ronds	da4 gong1dian4 (big palace)
tiny rabbit	pauvres voitures	jin1 ji1dan4 (golden egg)
tiny guitar	petite aiguille	hei1 mian2yang2 (black lamb)

In the case of French the position of the adjective does not change the semantic function, but a preliminary scan of the corpus does show a greater frequency of adjectives before nouns than the reverse in the early recordings of Philippe. The somewhat greater sophistication of the Chinese examples is at least partly a reflection that Chi-Chi is about six months older than Nina and Philippe.

Next, let us look at the choice function as the semantics of possession.

Choice Function for Possession

Mommy eyes	raquette de papa	mian2yang2 de mao2 (lamb's hair)
rabbit splinter	cordes de la raquette	ma1ma1 de hua4 (mother's talking)
horse feet	trains de tracteurs	Qi3qi3 de shu1 (Chi-Chi's book)
dolly dress	peau de Philippe	ge1ge1 de shu1 (brother's book)
		ba4ba4 de shu1 (father's book)

The same uniflected patterns of possession in English are exhibited in Adam I. Analysis in terms of a choice function is given in Suppes (1971) and will not be repeated here, except to note that for the English grammar, one production rule is

$$NP \rightarrow NP + NP$$

and the semantic tree is



Use of cardinal number names in noun phrases as already discussed above is illustrated in the following examples.

Number Function

one rabbit	une deux trous	wu3 ge4 xiao3tou1	(five thieves)
three ball			
two ladies			

In the Chinese example, the particle de does not occur, only the noun-classifier ge4. I emphasize that the frequency of cardinal number names is low in all three corpora.

Concluding Remarks. Within the confines of this paper I have restricted myself to some of the simplest examples of semantic functions in the speech of young children. I believe the more complete identification

of the set of such functions, and especially their sequence of appearance in the language of the child, will provide a new and significant way of looking at language acquisition. The relation of such functions to the linguistic concept of "deep structure" is apparent, but for a number of reasons that I cannot develop here I am not inclined to identify the two approaches.

An equally important aspect of model-theoretic semantics in the analysis of children's language is comparison of semantic functions across languages. The examples I have given bring out semantic similarities of English, French and Chinese, but they are really meant only to exhibit the methodology. More detailed and more quantitative comparisons are needed to assess the similarities and differences in a serious way.

Finally, I reiterate the main purpose of this paper. It is to show in an informal way how model-theoretic semantics may be used to give a straightforward analysis of the meaning of children's language. Such an analysis is an essential element of any empirically adequate theory of language or language acquisition. That a systematic account of meaning is lacking in most discussions of language acquisition is surprising, at least on any common-sense view of what aspects of language are important. The methods I have outlined, which derive from the formal work of Frege in the 19th century and Tarski in the 1930's, can help to fill this lacuna.

References

Gammon, E. A syntactical analysis of some first-grade readers. Technical Report No. 155, June 22, 1970, Stanford University, Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences. To appear in K. J. Hintikka, J. Moravcsik and P. Suppes (Eds.), Approaches to Natural Language, Reidel Publ. Co., 1972.

Suppes, P. Probabilistic grammars for natural languages. Synthese, 1970, 22, 95-116.

Suppes, P. Semantics of context-free fragments of natural languages. Technical Report No. 171, March 30, 1971, Stanford University, Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences. To appear in K. J. Hintikka, J. Moravcsik and P. Suppes (Eds.), Approaches to Natural Language, Reidel Publ. Co., 1972.

Footnotes

[1]The research reported here has been supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant NSFGJ-443X, and by the Office of Naval Research under Contract N00014-67-A-0112-0049.

[2]Such choice functions arise early in children's speech; I used them in Suppes (1971) in the analysis of Roger Brown's classic corpus Adam I. In the earlier article I required that $f_A(B) \in B$, which makes f a standard set-theoretical choice function. I have come to feel that the better choice is that $f_A(B) \in \wp B$, i.e., in the power set of B, which is the set of all subsets of B, and for this purpose, we may write, as I have in the text, $f_A(B) \subseteq B$. In the present case, we end up with

$$f_A(B) = A \cap B ,$$

and it might be asked why not dispense with the function f and not let de denote at all? My present view of the matter is that we assign the semantic function ψ to the rule

$$NP \rightarrow NP + MOD + NP .$$

We may want to replace the first NP not by an adjective, or an adjective-like word, but by a noun expressing possession as in ge1ge1 de shu1 (brother's book). Then intersection is totally inappropriate. Here $f_A(B)$ is the set of members of B possessed by A.

[3]The recording and transcribing of Nina's speech has been done by Mrs. Florence Yager of the Institute's staff.

(Continued from inside front cover)

96 R. C. Atkinson, J. W. Brelsford, and R. M. Shiffrin. Multi-process models for memory with applications to a continuous presentation task. April 13, 1966. (J. math. Psychol., 1967, 4, 277-300).
97 P. Suppes and E. Crothers. Some remarks on stimulus-response theories of language learning. June 12, 1966.
98 R. Bjork. All-or-none subprocesses in the learning of complex sequences. (J. math. Psychol., 1968, 1, 182-195).
99 E. Gammon. The statistical determination of linguistic units. July 1, 1966.
100 P. Suppes, L. Hyman, and M. Jerman. Linear structural models for response and latency performance in arithmetic. (In J. P. Hill (ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology. Minneapolis, Minn.: 1967. Pp. 160-200).
101 J. L. Young. Effects of intervals between reinforcements and test trials in paired-associate learning. August 1, 1966.
102 H. A. Wilson. An investigation of linguistic unit size in memory processes. August 3, 1966.
103 J. T. Townsend. Choice behavior in a cued-recognition task. August 8, 1966.
104 W. H. Batchelder. A mathematical analysis of multi-level verbal learning. August 9, 1966.
105 H. A. Taylor. The observing response in a cued psychophysical task. August 10, 1966.
106 R. A. Bjork. Learning and short-term retention of paired associates in relation to specific sequences of interpresentation intervals. August 11, 1966.
107 R. C. Atkinson and R. M. Shiffrin. Some Two-process models for memory. September 30, 1966.
108 P. Suppes and C. Ihrke. Accelerated program in elementary-school mathematics--the third year. January 30, 1967.
109 P. Suppes and I. Rosenthal-Hill. Concept formation by kindergarten children in a card-sorting task. February 27, 1967.
110 R. C. Atkinson and R. M. Shiffrin. Human memory: a proposed system and its control processes. March 21, 1967.
111 Theodore S. Rodgers. Linguistic considerations in the design of the Stanford computer-based curriculum in initial reading. June 1, 196
112 Jack M. Knutson. Spelling drills using a computer-assisted instructional system. June 30, 1967.
113 R. C. Atkinson. Instruction in initial reading under computer control: the Stanford Project. July 14, 1967.
114 J. W. Brelsford, Jr. and R. C. Atkinson. Recall of paired-associates as a function of overt and covert rehearsal procedures. July 21, 1967.
115 J. H. Steiger. Some results concerning subjective probability structures with semiorders. August 1, 1967
116 D. E. Rumelhart. The effects of interpresentation intervals on performance in a continuous paired-associate task. August 11, 1967.
117 E. J. Fishman, L. Keller, and R. E. Atkinson. Massed vs. distributed practice in computerized spelling drills. August 18, 1967.
118 G. J. Groen. An investigation of some counting algorithms for simple addition problems. August 21, 1967.
119 H. A. Wilson and R. C. Atkinson. Computer-based instruction in initial reading: a progress report on the Stanford Project. August 25, 1967.
120 F. S. Roberts and P. Suppes. Some problems in the geometry of visual perception. August 31, 1967. (Synthese, 1967, 17, 173-201)
121 D. Jamison. Bayesian decisions under total and partial ignorance. D. Jamison and J. Kozielecki. Subjective probabilities under total uncertainty. September 4, 1967.
122 R. C. Atkinson. Computerized instruction and the learning process. September 15, 1967.
123 W. K. Estes. Outline of a theory of punishment. October 1, 1967.
124 T. S. Rodgers. Measuring vocabulary difficulty: An analysis of item variables in learning Russian-English and Japanese-English vocabulary parts. December 18, 1967.
125 W. K. Estes. Reinforcement in human learning. December 20, 1967.
126 G. L. Wolford, D. L. Wessel, W. K. Estes. Further evidence concerning scanning and sampling assumptions of visual detection models. January 31, 1968.
127 R. C. Atkinson and R. M. Shiffrin. Some speculations on storage and retrieval processes in long-term memory. February 2, 1968.
128 John Holmgren. Visual detection with imperfect recognition. March 29, 1968.
129 Lucille B. Mlodnosky. The Frostig and the Bender Gestalt as predictors of reading achievement. April 12, 1968.
130 P. Suppes. Some theoretical models for mathematics learning. April 15, 1968. (Journal of Research and Development in Education, 1967, 1, 5-22)
131 G. M. Olson. Learning and retention in a continuous recognition task. May 15, 1968.
132 Ruth Norene Hartley. An investigation of list types and cues to facilitate initial reading vocabulary acquisition. May 29, 1968.
133 P. Suppes. Stimulus-response theory of finite automata. June 19, 1968.
134 N. Moler and P. Suppes. Quantifier-free axioms for constructive plane geometry. June 20, 1968. (In J. C. H. Gerretsen and F. Oort (Eds.), Compositio Mathematica. Vol. 20. Groningen, The Netherlands: Wolters-Noordhoff, 1968. Pp. 143-152.)
135 W. K. Estes and D. P. Horst. Latency as a function of number of response alternatives in paired-associate learning. July 1, 1968.
136 M. Schlag-Rey and P. Suppes. High-order dimensions in concept identification. July 2, 1968. (Psychom. Sci., 1968, 11, 141-142)
137 R. M. Shiffrin. Search and retrieval processes in long-term memory. August 15, 1968.
138 R. D. Freund, G. R. Loftus, and R.C. Atkinson. Applications of multiprocess models for memory to continuous recognition tasks. December 18, 1968.
139 R. C. Atkinson. Information delay in human learning. December 18, 1968.
140 R. C. Atkinson, J. E. Holmgren, and J. F. Juola. Processing time as influenced by the number of elements in the visual display. March 14, 1969.
141 P. Suppes, E. F. Loftus, and M. Jerman. Problem-solving on a computer-based teletype. March 25, 1969.
142 P. Suppes and Mona Morningstar. Evaluation of three computer-assisted instruction programs. May 2, 1969.
143 P. Suppes. On the problems of using mathematics in the development of the social sciences. May 12, 1969.
144 Z. Domotor. Probabilistic relational structures and their applications. May 14, 1969.
145 R. C. Atkinson and T. D. Wickens. Human memory and the concept of reinforcement. May 20, 1969.
146 R. J. Titiev. Some model-theoretic results in measurement theory. May 22, 1969.
147 P. Suppes. Measurement: Problems of theory and application. June 12, 1969.
148 P. Suppes and C. Ihrke. Accelerated program in elementary-school mathematics--the fourth year. August 7, 1969.
149 D. Rundus and R.C. Atkinson. Rehearsal in free recall: A procedure for direct observation. August 12, 1969.
150 P. Suppes and S. Feldman. Young children's comprehension of logical connectives. October 15, 1969.

(Continued on back cover)

(Continued from inside back cover)

151 Joaquim H. Laubsch. An adaptive teaching system for optimal item allocation. November 14, 1969.
152 Roberta L. Klatzky and Richard C. Atkinson. Memory scans based on alternative test stimulus representations. November 25, 1969.
153 John E. Holmgren. Response latency as an indicant of information processing in visual search tasks. March 16, 1970.
154 Patrick Suppes. Probabilistic grammars for natural languages. May 15, 1970.
155 E. Gammon. A syntactical analysis of some first-grade readers. June 22, 1970.
156 Kenneth N. Wexler. An automaton analysis of the learning of a miniature system of Japanese. July 24, 1970.
157 R. C. Atkinson and J.A. Paulson. An approach to the psychology of instruction. August 14, 1970.
158 R.C. Atkinson, J.D. Fletcher, H.C. Chetin, and C.M. Stauffer. Instruction in initial reading under computer control: the Stanford project. August 13, 1970.
159 Dewey J. Rundus. An analysis of rehearsal processes in free recall. August 21, 1970.
160 R.L. Klatzky, J.F. Juola, and R.C. Atkinson. Test stimulus representation and experimental context effects in memory scanning.
161 William A. Rottmayer. A formal theory of perception. November 13, 1970.
162 Elizabeth Jane Fishman Loftus. An analysis of the structural variables that determine problem-solving difficulty on a computer-based teletype. December 18, 1970.
163 Joseph A. Van Campen. Towards the automatic generation of programmed foreign-language instructional materials. January 11, 1971.
164 Jamesine Friend and R.C. Atkinson. Computer-assisted instruction in programming: AID. January 25, 1971.
165 Lawrence James Hubert. A formal model for the perceptual processing of geometric configurations. February 19, 1971.
166 J. F. Juola, I.S. Fischler, C.T. Wood, and R.C. Atkinson. Recognition time for information stored in long-term memory.
167 R.L. Klatzky and R.C. Atkinson. Specialization of the cerebral hemispheres in scanning for information in short-term memory.
168 J.D. Fletcher and R.C. Atkinson. An evaluation of the Stanford CAI program in initial reading (grades K through 3). March 12, 1971.
169 James F. Juola and R.C. Atkinson. Memory scanning for words versus categories.
170 Ira S. Fischler and James F. Juola. Effects of repeated tests on recognition time for information in long-term memory.
171 Patrick Suppes. Semantics of context-free fragments of natural languages. March 30, 1971.
172 Jamesine Friend. Instruct coders' manual. May 1, 1971.
173 R.C. Atkinson and R.M. Shiffrin. The control processes of short-term memory. April 19, 1971.
174 Patrick Suppes. Computer-assisted instruction at Stanford. May 19, 1971.
175 D. Jamison, J.D. Fletcher, P. Suppes and R.C. Atkinson. Cost and performance of computer-assisted instruction for compensatory education.
176 Joseph Offir. Some mathematical models of individual differences in learning and performance. June 28, 1971.
177 Richard C. Atkinson and James F. Juola. Factors influencing speed and accuracy of word recognition. August 12, 1971.
178 P. Suppes, A. Goldberg, G. Kanz, B. Searle and C. Stauffer. Teacher's handbook for CAI courses. September 1, 1971.
179 Adele Goldberg. A generalized instructional system for elementary mathematical logic. October 11, 1971.
180 Max Jerman. Instruction in problem solving and an analysis of structural variables that contribute to problem-solving difficulty. November 12, 1971.
181 Patrick Suppes. On the grammar and model-theoretic semantics of children's noun phrases. November 29, 1971.